Remarks

The application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated March 3, 2005. Claims 1 and 5 have been amended to correct formal matters not effecting the scope of the Claims. Claims 9-26 have been added. Claims 1-26 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 5, 15, 19 and 23-26 being in independent form.

Claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly obvious from U.S. Patent 6,092,194 to Touboul in view of U.S. Patent 5,859,966 Hayman et al. Applicants have carefully considered the Examiner's comments and the cited art, and respectfully submit independent claims 1 and 5 are patentable over the cited art, for at least the following reasons.

Independent Claim 1 relates to a method for preventing hostile use of computer resources by an application running on a workstation. A list of services that are not allowed for access by unspecified applications is provided, and when such unspecified application runs on the workstation, the application is prevented from accessing any resource directly. Any direct or indirect request for access to specific services is analyzed, to determine whether such request is allowable according to the list. The workstation processes the request if it is allowable. The unspecified application is prevented from accessing the requested resource if the request is not allowable. The resource may be any local or remote resource, such as, memory allocation, files, directories, operations with files and directories, such as copy, delete or compress, or any other operation leading to a permanent change in the workstation or its periphery.

Touboul, as understood by Applicants, relates to a system and method for preventing hostile downloadables from being downloaded to a computer or network and executed. In other words, Touboul blocks the undesirable application so that it never reaches and runs on the client computer (see, for example, Touboul, col. 2, lines 21-28 and col. 3, lines 10-13).

Hayman et al., as understood by Applicants, relates to a security system for computer systems that imposes specific limitations on who has access to the computer system and to exactly what operations and data.

The Office Action acknowledges that Touboul does not explicitly disclose when and unspecified application runs on the workstation, preventing the application from accessing any resource directly. Column 7, lines 25-30 of Hayman et al. are cited as allegedly disclosing this feature.

Hayman et al. describes dividing the totality of MAC hierarchies into a small number of distinct and non-overlapping regions as shown in Fig. 4, including an administrative region 41, a user region 42 and a virus prevention region 43. Hayman et al. further describes that all system executables are stored in the virus prevention region so they gain benefit of write-protection. That is, when a process runs a program, a copy of the program is made into memory allocated to that process. If the program contains malicious code which attempts to modify any objects in the virus prevention region, access will be denied (Col. 7, lines 18-30).

Accordingly, as understood by Applicant, Touboul relates to a system that determines whether to allow or block incoming downloadables. Hayman et al. relates to a system that denies access to malicious code that attempts to modify objects in a virus prevention region.

However, Applicants find no teaching or suggestion in the cited art of a method for preventing hostile use of computer resources by an application running on a workstation, comprising: providing a list of services that are not allowed for access by unspecified applications, when such unspecified application runs on the workstation, preventing the application from accessing any resource directly, analyzing any direct or indirect request for access to specific services, to determine whether such request is allowable according to the list, if the request is allowable,

allowing the workstation to process it and if the request is not allowable, preventing the unspecified application from accessing the requested resource, as recited in independent claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants submit independent claim 1 is patentable over the cited art. Independent claim 24 is believed to be patentable over the cited art for at least similar reasons.

Applicants also find no teaching or suggestion in the cited art of an agent for protecting a workstation against the hostile use of computer resources by an unspecified application running on the workstation, comprising means for detecting an unspecified application running on the workstation, means for determining the requests for resources to be used by the unspecified application, etc, as recited in independent claim 5.

Accordingly, Applicants submit independent claim 5 is also patentable over the cited art.

The new independent claims are also believed to be patentable over the cited art. For example, Applicants find no teaching or suggestion in the cited art of a method for preventing hostile use of computer resources in a local network by an application running on a workstation in the local network, comprising providing a list of computer resources that cannot be used by certain applications downloaded from outside the workstation, determining whether computer resources in any direct or indirect request by the downloaded application to use computer resources is in the list of computer resources, such that the request is allowable, wherein if the request is allowable, allowing the workstation to use the computer resources requested and wherein if the request is not allowable, preventing the workstation from using the computer resources requested, as recited in independent claim 15. Independent claim 25 is believed to be patentable for at least similar reasons.

Applicants also find no teaching or suggestion in the cited art of an agent for preventing hostile use of computer resources in a local network by an application running on a workstation in the local network, comprising means for detecting certain applications downloaded from outside the

workstation, means for identifying direct requests by the certain applications to use the computer resources, means for identifying indirect requests by the certain applications to use the computer resources, means for determining whether indirect requests by the certain applications would be allowable if made directly by the certain applications and means for preventing the workstation from using the requested computer resources when at least one of the direct or indirect requests is determined not to be allowable, as recited in independent claim 19.

Applicants also find no teaching or suggestion in the cited art of a method for preventing hostile use of computer resources in a local network by an application running on a workstation in the local network, comprising providing a list of computer resources that are not allowed to be used by one or more applications downloaded from outside the workstation, determining whether any direct or indirect request by the one or more downloaded applications to use computer resources are allowable according to the list, allowing the workstation to process the direct or indirect request if the request is allowable and preventing the workstation from processing the direct or indirect request if the request is not allowable, as recited in independent claim 23. New independent claim 26 is believed to be patentable for at least similar reasons.

The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required in connection with this amendment and to credit any overpayment to our Deposit Account No. 03-3125.

If a petition for an extension of time is required to make this response timely, this paper should be considered to be such a petition, and the Commissioner is authorized to charge the requisite fees to our deposit account No. 03-3125.

If a telephone interview could advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney.

Entry of this amendment and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

RICHARD F. JAWORSKI
Reg. No.33,515
Attorney for Applicants
Cooper & Dunham LLP
Tel.: (212) 278-0400